



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ONENESS OF THE HOMERIC LANGUAGE

BY A. SHEWAN

Some Homeric critics of the nineteenth century had a number of fixed beliefs which they regarded as inexpugnable. One of these was that the language of Homer could be used to show that certain passages, books, and strata in the epics were later than others. How far was that belief justified? There is no question here of the origin and nature of that language, or of its relation to any Greek dialect or group of dialects. The point is only this: taking the language of the poems as we have it, have such differences in respect of it been proved to exist between different parts of the poems as to establish difference of age?

The boldest of these scholars worked with great minuteness and with full confidence that the linguistic and metrical criteria which they had devised enabled them to cut up the poems into what von Christ described as *minutulas particulas* of varying age. One recalls the enterprises of Hoffmann, Giseke, Geppert, and Kluge. But these results were not acceptable, even to scholars of those wild days, and are never mentioned now. The treatises are, for all their effect on the minds of Homerists, as though they had never been written.

But the failures of individuals did not lead to the abandonment of the method. The mania for dissection and the hunt for infallible tests have continued even into the present century. Carl Robert's endeavor, by arms and Ionisms, is perhaps the most famous of all, and has proved as futile as any. The author's extraordinary acuteness could not blind his critics to defects of procedure, and friends and foes alike fell upon the scheme and condemned it. The arbitrary manipulation of armature epithets, the violence used to parts of the poems to compel them to come into the design, and the abuse of Ionisms were fatal faults. The linguistic element in the proof was criticized with special severity. Bréal and others asked in vain for evidence that iteratives, *ἄν*, and similar usages were purely Ionic. Even individual words, as *καρτερός* and *ἄγινέω*, were banned under this description. Witte, in the most recent condemnation of

the *Studien*, expresses the opinion that the book proved this much, that pieces of the poetry containing descriptions of armor that was purely Mycenaean are *not* now to be extricated from the mass.¹

More recently Della Seta² has made a distribution by means of certain appellatives, 'Αχαιοί, 'Αργεῖοι, Δαραιοί, etc. I think there has hardly been a favorable word on the resultant grouping, except one from Professor Murray, who surely cannot have noticed that Κ and Ω are found to belong to an ancient stratum. Zuretti³ showed that the proof was based on a misappreciation of the metrical way of Homer. Pasquali also objected,⁴ and cruelly pointed out that in Witte's distribution, in his *Singular u. Plural*, which appeared about the same time, and for which see below, Ω had been classed as a late book.

Still more recently Mr. Drewitt has found in a new theory of the Augment a means of testing the age of various passages. The theory is developed in two papers in *CQ*, VI, 44 ff., and 104 ff., and much is made of poor materials; but the liberties taken with the Homeric corpus, the elasticity of the method, and the disregard of considerations which are vital are such as to bar its acceptance absolutely (*CP*, VII, 396 ff.). His further note in *CP*, VIII, 349 ff., is replied to, *ibid.*, IX, 189 ff., and his last state is worse than his first. The more his statistics are examined the worse they appear.

Bechtel submits yet another criterion in *Vocalcontraction*. His work is based on the *disjecti membra poetae* as ascertained by Robert for the *Iliad* and by Wilamowitz for the *Odyssey*, and that is fatal to Bechtel's scheme for all those who do not accept these delimitations. Mülder, now the noblest Unitarian of them all, has observed that probably Wilamowitz himself would hardly hold his *Untersuchungen*, published nearly thirty years ago, to be "canonical" now. Bechtel's initial comparison of A, carefully expurgated, as an ancient book with Ω as part of the "youngest stratum" must still further reduce the number of his adherents. Cauer at once reminded him of the schism in dissecting circles which was caused by the neo-Homerists who propounded a new heresy (see below) about A.

¹ Pauly-Wissowa, *Homeros*, 2239.

² In *Rendic. d. R. Accad. d. Linc.*, 1907.

³ *Riv. di Filol.*, 1908, 232; cf. Witte in *Glotta*, IV, 240.

⁴ *Atene e Roma*, 1907, 369.

Karl Witte has found the touchstone in the “poetic plural.” See his *Singular u. Plural*, supplemented by arguments from statistics of *στήθεα* and *πήματα* in *Glotta*, I, 132 ff. He proceeds from the *Voraussetzung* that in the beginning of speech every noun had its natural number, some the singular, some the plural, and some apparently the dual. But does not that require proof? Some have believed that number and other inflections were originally separate words. Witte’s *θύραι* and *πύλαι* can hardly be considered original plurals unless doors came into use universally in more than one piece. And there are two other hypothetical propositions. But it is enough to suggest that the one fundamental principle requires to be established. As regards *στήθεα* and *πήματα*, the proof is not satisfying. The “poetic plural” of *στῆθος* being almost confined to the dative, the reason for this is discovered to be its metrical superiority, in the forms *στήθεσσι* and *στήθεσι*, to the dative singular; and the, at first sight certainly, astounding statement is made that “forms like *στήθει* were regarded as spondees.” Witte points to such cases as *ἔγχει ὄρεξάσθω*, but no one can say that that did not originally stand *ἔγχε' ὄρεξάσθω*, as Van Leeuwen in fact prints it; and to cases in which forms like *στήθει* were indubitably spondees, but these are few. Taking all the neuters in -os mentioned by Witte in his note on *στήθει*, I find that out of 108 occurrences of the dative singular in Homer, while 63 are doubtful, only 2 are certainly spondees. These figures do not show that there was any *Hindernis* to the use of the dactylic dative singular in the hexameter.

Next, *Analogiebildung* is appealed to; *στήθεσσι* is formed on the analogy of *φρεσί*. But who shall say which is the earlier among the two sets of stock phrases set out by Witte in which the words are used? It is said that *φρένες* was originally *plurale tantum*, but that will be granted by those alone who believe that primitive man’s knowledge of human anatomy was as good as the modern surgeon’s. The larger number of the occurrences of the plural *φρένες* is also brought into evidence, but the same may be said, though in a less degree, of *στῆθος*. We also find an argument based on *φρένα* and *φρένας*, while *φρενί* and *φρεσί*, which are of the same metrical value, are left out of consideration. And finally, for *πήμα*, *ἄλγος* is claimed as the model; *πήματα πάσχει* follows *ἄλγεα πάσχει*. But

why not vice versa? Witte answers that, in 12 out of 14 occurrences of *πήματα*, the word follows the Bucolic Diaerises, and, if one considers "the importance which the fifth foot had for new formations in Latin," one will, he thinks, hardly doubt that the plural *πήματα* has been formed on metrical considerations. Many will think that some better evidence is necessary on this as on other points discussed, and, until it is forthcoming, we must hesitate to accept his test and its results.

The *μέγα ἔργον* is still *ἀρεκτον*. The operators have been told so by those of their own household, and even that they never can succeed in a general dismemberment. But the test was too good to be abandoned lightly. As with the Repetitions, it was easy of application, materials were abundant, and results of a kind were considerable. And so the process continued till a very general belief arose that certain books had been proved to be products of an inferior age, posterior to the "bloom" of epic poetry, and this belief is one of the main props of various hypotheses as to the rise of the Greek epic. Wolf had reversed the process, but von Humboldt told him at once that he had begun at the wrong end. "You must begin with the language," he wrote, but Wolf never made the venture. *In universum*, he had admitted, *idem sonus, idem habitus sententiarum, orationis, numerorum*, but this he said was deceptive; books separated by one or two centuries *simillima facie fallunt*. But he never gave a detailed proof. In the same way Geddes never published his promised work on "the department of *linguistica*," which was to furnish "confirmatory evidence" in support of his own theory. It is dangerous to make theories first and then to constrain the language to fit them. Cauer remarks that the *Zerlegungen* effected through the language cannot be made to correspond to those, and they are many, that have been made on other considerations.

But let us consider specific results. First, it became commonplace that the language of the *Odyssey* belonged to a later age than that of the *Iliad*, and this chiefly on the ground that it showed signs of higher development. But it was a belief that grew in the minds of those who willed it so, and cannot be said to have been based on a formal demonstration. Early efforts, in disregard of L. Friedländer, were inadequate. The matter coming to be *chose jugée*, it was

only necessary to quote an expression or two. Bernhardy could bring himself to note that *δυμαλόεις* and *φόβος* are frequent in the *Iliad*, but occur only once each in the *Odyssey*; Bergk, that *ξέῆς* was the property of the *Odyssey*, and Geddes, that *διαπρόσιον* was peculiar to the *Achilleid*, without inquiring if there were any special reason therefor; Wilkins, that one noun in -ις was exceptional in regard to its accusative and one adjective in regard to its comparative. The very paucity of such "peculiarities" confirmed the judgment of von Christ, who certainly was not averse to disruption and who surely spoke from experience, that "the differences were small." Spitzner, fresh from his great investigation, expressed himself to the same effect. There are few of the differences which have been noted that have not proved to be susceptible of explanation. A little deliberation would have saved many mistakes. The idea that *abstracta* were more numerous in the *Odyssey*, and that this proved its language to be more advanced, was as old as Geppert, and was constantly repeated, as by Bernhardy, Burnouf, Croiset, and Cauer. Professor Scott has shown¹ that there is no difference in this respect between the two poems. It only required a count, as once at the English court it only required the weighing of the pail of water with the fish in it. The fewness of the duals of historical tenses in the *Odyssey* was also used in evidence, but the reason is clear without reference to any linguistic theory;² the influence of subject on language was not sufficiently regarded.³ Dr. Monro, in his full statement in his edition of *Odyssey v-w*, recognizes it, but seems to forget it, as in his discussion of the occurrences of the epithets of certain deities. His case on the grammar has been examined and refuted by Miss Stawell,⁴ and no counter demonstration has appeared, so far as I am aware.

It was Dr. Monro too who exhibited the grammatical indications of the affinity of Ι Κ Ψ Ω with the *Odyssey*. This idea also had, by much repetition and the occasional citation of a linguistic anomaly, been nearly worked up to the dignity of a Homeric certainty; these

¹ *CR*, XXIV, 8 ff.

² *CP*, VIII, 285.

³ Another important factor, hardly ever mentioned, is the much larger extent of "speech" in the *Odyssey*.

⁴ *Homer and the Iliad*, App. C.

books were obviously "Odyssean," though it would have puzzled some who used the conclusion to say just how it had been proved or just what it meant. But when a great Homeric scholar collected the evidence from grammar, it looked as if what had been a mere idea was converted into fact. Yet the case has not survived examination. Miss Stawell showed that, as regards Ψ and Ω , the evidence was not properly appreciated and the instances often misinterpreted. The refutation was on Dr. Monro's own lines, the only difference being that the statistics were given with more completeness. A cardinal error had been that critics had not considered whether these books were not as much "Iliadic" as "Odyssean." They are, all four of them.

The counter demonstration stands. Only one attempt, so far as I am aware, has been made to question its correctness. Professor Murray essayed to prove Miss Stawell wrong on one point—the uses of $\epsilon\nu$. His proof, which relied on all the stock expedients of German criticism of the inferior order, was examined in *CQ*, IV, 228 ff. There is nothing in it to induce one to revise one's opinion of Miss Stawell's refutation of the "Odyssean" case.

It is a marvel that so little fight has been shown, for the "Odyssean" label was most useful. You could always discredit a thing by mentioning that it was found in one of these late books. Mr. Drewitt seems to find a passage, a line, or a phrase "Odyssean" when it is in his way. He (like Father Browne) adds Θ to the depressed class. Mr. Andrew Lang always wondered why it had not been proscribed, seeing that it had been shown that it was written "as a prologue" to, and consequently could not be earlier than, I. But now it has come into its own. But where is the proof? Why has it not been treated like K? K, $\eta\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\pi\omega\rho\sigma\Delta\omega\lambda\omega\epsilon\iota\alpha$, was, to German criticism, unspeakably inferior. Yet its language, tested in every way possible, turns out to be just like that of the rest of the *Iliad*, and the lay has been accepted as genuine and ancient by Rothe, Allen, Lang, Drerup, Scott, and Van Leeuwen. These are good names on a Homeric bond. Cauer is content with the old cry; the language of K *den Spätling verrät*. But, if the "Odyssean" theory is to be revived, there must be a formal demonstration, for there is now much against it.

The metrical case, as stated by Dr. Monro, proved to be as weak as the grammatical, and the four books were found on examination not to hang together in regard to the damning phenomena. In fact the criteria often serve to split up the tainted group, instead of proving them to be a symmetrical mass. Take Lehrs' hephthe-mimeral (*Ar.*³, 387 ff.). The statistics dissociate Ω from I and attach it to A.

The so-called "Continuation" of the *Odyssey* may be cited as another case. The particulars of the linguistic proof, which Dr. Monro pronounced to be overwhelming, have been examined in *CP*, VIII, 284 ff. Difficulties seem to yield to treatment. This is a case which is not due to modern prejudice, but which goes back to Aristarchus, if his opinion has been correctly transmitted. The post-Homeric ways and beliefs in ω have been held fatal. It has been shown, I think, in *CP*, IX, 160 ff., that even this ground of objection, though accepted almost universally, is unreal.

By comparison with these products of decadent days the language of the bulk of the *Iliad* was held to be pure and good, especially that of its core, the *Mēnis*. It was hard to enucleate a kernel that all could accept; many were the schemes, but none was chosen. But all were agreed that the first book, A, was part of it, when there suddenly arose some lewd critics, boasting themselves to be somebody, who declared that the *Lay of the Wrath*, the ancient *Kern* of the *Iliad*, was in fact the latest, or nearly the latest, of all the components of that poem, and invented to cement the other lays into a poem about Ilium. This "blameless *Mēnis*," as it had lovingly been called, had always been the unsurpassable product of the best epic days, and there were those who could speak of its absolute *Unteilbarkeit*. It was a standard for reference; its diction, when pruned of what was modern and accidental (and inconvenient to your pet theory), was a perfect model; its theology was sound and pristine, and its culture generally unimpeachable; it was the repository of every Homeric glory. Now it was said that it was *not*, and, if it was not, then what of the criticism, prolonged, labored and multiplex, by which it had been raised to that high eminence? The shock was as severe as it was unexpected. Men had as little thought to hear of Tiber turning and flowing up to his sources as of a breath

against the hoary, solitary majesty of the *Wrath*. That much of the old linguistic case against other parts of the poems would need to be reconsidered, if this view were upheld, needs hardly to be said. But of course all will not accept the degradation of A. Yet one thing is certain. This ancient of books, like those that were in popular estimation "Odyssean," has itself much affinity with the *Odyssey*. That has been proved in detail, and Mr. Drewitt has at length admitted that the book is "purely Odyssean from beginning to end." Had that been foreseen fifty years ago, it would have saved volumes of all but useless writing.

If we turn now to the individual tests, the case seems equally bad. The criteria do not act. The base metal of the great *emblēmata* is affected as little by these solvents as the pure gold of the *Wrath* itself. Take *F*, which serves, as Bréal says, *d'expédition en toute occasion*, and try K and the "Continuation" by it. For the former it was deemed sufficient, by the few who applied the digamma, to point to one or two neglects. If that be sufficient, what part of the epic is safe? It was much the same with the "Continuation"; *F* was hardly seriously used as a test of its genuineness. And wisely, for a comparison of the "Continuation" and A in regard to observances and neglects of *F*, confined for greater assurance to the certainly digammated roots common to both, shows that these two tracts of the epic are practically in the same case. But, if they are separated by centuries which were a *Verwitterungsepochē* for *F*, must not neglects swarm in the later lay by comparison with the earlier? The weakness has been felt, and has led one authority to say it is necessary, in such comparisons, to exclude from consideration the passages which critics have shown to be interpolations, and another actually to disregard what he holds to be borrowings or imitations. That is to render discussion nugatory. One need not insist that the comparison must be on a text absolutely (as in a case in Thumb's well-known essay) *ohne Korrektur*. There are changes in the wording which no one denies have taken place, and the originals of which all are disposed to accept. But, when we are asked to agree to prune a book down to the condition in which Robert or Fick or Hennings or some other authority sees its virgin form, we are asked to open the door to interminable wrangling. *F* is in fact hopeless. Many high

authorities, not merely Unitarians, but even stout believers in gradual growth, such as Friedländer and Jebb, have discouraged the attempts to apply it. And obvious difficulties in the way have been pointed out. For one thing, the experts are not agreed on the general digamma question. The extremes seem to be represented by what Mr. Agar calls “the always-ready-when-wanted idea” and his own Bentleian belief that the poems can be thoroughly cleansed of all neglects. For another, they differ widely in their views in regard to individual words or roots. Compare some of the old lists, such as Heyne’s or McIvor’s, with the compact selection drawn up by Thumb. The attributions of *f* which are prompted by the interest of the moment are at times astonishing.

Articular uses were also much in favor for the purpose of impugning the genuineness of passages or even books. A real article developing from a demonstrative was supposed to synchronize with a developing *epos*. But even this postulated position is anything but a certainty. It has yet to be shown—and it will not, if some authorities are right, be easy to show—that the lays which are classed as earliest did not know the *verus sincerusque Articulus*. Attic uses are *fest* in A. Meillet cannot believe that any part of the poems shows no knowledge of an *élément si généralement repandu sur tout le domaine hellénique dès la date la plus ancienne*. The special treatises, by Stummer, Förstemann, and Koch, give little help. The first-named made elaborate calculations, which, even accepting his particular views as to late and early tracts, only prove a slight difference between the most ancient and the most modern lays, though these are supposed to be separated by several centuries. But even allowing the developing article, we are puzzled by the results. A late lay, we are told, must show numerous instances of the Attic uses of this part of speech. Many such were pointed out in K. They should equally abound in the “Continuation” of the *Odyssey*. But in the latter, which is longer than K, it is a question if there is a single stumble into what is held to be later practice. How is this freedom from the new influence to be explained? How is it possible for the “Continuation” to be very late, and not to show degeneration in regard to *f* and *δ η τό*?

Certain prepositional uses were alleged to be characteristic of the “Odyssean” books. Miss Stawell showed that the statistics have

been wrongly given, and it is easy to produce examples of the impugned uses from the other parts of the *Iliad*. Giseke essayed to divide up the *Iliad* by taking the prepositions as a criterion. Curtius was surely right in holding that the only satisfactory starting-point for such an inquiry would be the development of propositions from adverbs. Metrical convenience too was not considered. Yet it often determined the choice between *ἐν* and *μετά*, *ἀνά* and *κατά*, etc., and sometimes caused an alteration in the case of the noun. There are few points of language on which the author or authors of the poems took more liberties than with the prepositions.

Another test was found in *ἄν* and *κέ*, but it, like others, suffered for a time from the inability of the learned to make up their minds as to the origin and uses of these two particles. Some have affirmed—Dr. Monro is one—that their meanings and uses are not identical, but Fick considers that they are, and that *ἄν* was introduced by his Ionian translator or transliterator. The whole matter has been set at rest by Dr. Monro in his *H.G.*², 393 and *Odyssey*, 464, where it is held, by reference to Leo Meyer, that *ἄν* is proto-Hellenic. That *ἄν* is not a Homeric particle has been pronounced by Professor Platt “a hypothesis not only baseless, but, as clearly shown by Monro, actually contrary to the evidence of the text.” But a further point is that purely Ionian intrusions should show an abundance of instances of *ἄν*. This is not the case with K or the “Continuation.”

The form *ἐσ* is a failure too. I think I have shown elsewhere that, in respect of its use, the two poems are in exactly similar case, that in some 5,000 lines of “late” portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* there are only 13 occurrences of the objectionable form, and that even these can be purged away, if only the same license is permitted in the way of emendation that Bechtel employs in his comparison of the occurrences of the preposition in A and Ω respectively. Readers of Robert’s *Studien* know what ample use is made of *ἐσ*, *ἄν*, and the iteratives to discredit individual passages. The evidence derived from these *indicia* is absolutely worthless. Yet the proofs of spuriousness based on these and the armature can be implicitly accepted in spite of all that has been written in condemnation of Robert’s dissection of the *Iliad*. Professor Bolling, in a paper in *Am. J. Phil.*, XXXIII, 401 ff., for which—or for the opening section of

which—all who are interested in the literature of the digamma must be grateful, accepts the Fick-Bechtel view of ἑ̄s absolutely. One would think it had never been questioned. But in Smyth's *Ionic*, 601, we read that "Fick's attempt to exclude the Ionic ἑ̄s from the Homeric epos is a failure," depending, for one thing, on the emendation of "many passages in the (*se judice*) older books," etc.; cf. the *Enchiridium*, 534. Professor Bolling also, in the detailed proof with which his paper closes, follows Robert's analysis and thinks that "requires no justification." No justification! One might rather ask what leading authority has ever accepted it. The principles on which it was made were universally condemned—and that not only by Unitarians—when it first appeared, and no attempt has ever been made to render it acceptable. Any individual is at liberty to approve of it *en bloc*; but a theory that is based on the resultant scheme of the *Iliad* will find as few adherents as can now be claimed by Geppert's fifty-column list of spurious books and passages.

Certain perfects in -κα have also been pressed into service. They were one of the counts in the indictment against K, and they have been used elsewhere. Professor Scott appears to have disposed of them in a paper on these perfects and the Article in *CP*, VI, 156 ff. The same scholar has (*ibid.*, VII, 293 ff.) shown the futility of the test by Patronymics, propounded by W. Meyer, and approved "with slight reservation" by Cauer.

How far archaizing is to be found in the Homeric poems is a question on which the varieties of view are innumerable. As regards language, late poets are said to have affected the antique, and their mistakes, called pseudo-archaisms, have been taken as indications of the late age of these wrongful intruders. But little has been made of them. The caution expressed by Monro and Jebb at an early stage had a sobering effect. An attempt was, however, made by Monro himself to strengthen the case against the *Doloneia* by specifying instances which "might be" included in this category, but detailed examination has shown that in almost every case another explanation is possible. One hears little of pseudo-archaisms now.

Other tests have similarly failed their patrons. The optatives do not work well. Here the subjective element leaves discussions

sicklied over with a very decided cast of doubt. When investigating them some years ago I lighted on a case in which three Homeric men of mold said of two optatives in one line, the first that both were potential, the second that both were concessive, and the third that one was potential and the other concessive. No test that gives such scope for diversity of appreciation can furnish tangible results. The datives in *-oις* and *-ης* have not had the attention given them that was claimed on Nauck's statistics. Mr. Drewitt seems to give up that useful genitive in *-οο*. The genitive plurals of the first declension will not square with the facts. There seems to be one certain case of the contracted form in the four "Odyssean" books, and that one is in a line in K which some of its defenders are willing to sacrifice. Mere peculiarities of vocabulary are out of fashion. *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* would hardly be noted now. If more regard had been paid to the scholiast's simple *ἴσως δὲ οὐδὲ ἐπῆλθεν αὐτῷ χρεῖα*, much time and labor might have been saved. The dangers of arguing from Seeck's elaborate lists were pointed out by Fraenkel. The specialities of "Odyssean" diction have not survived examination by Miss Stawell and Professor Scott. Professor Murray (*RGE*², 190) approves, but thinks it strange that this should be hailed as a separatist defeat. It is probable that many will continue to regard it as such.

So much for the individual tests. Now many of those who employ them are ready to admit, on the researches which have been made, that the language of Hesiod's poems and the Hymns shows that these were composed at a later age than the bulk of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Rzach sums up in Pauly-Wissowa, *Hesiodos*, 1173 ff. But many believe that parts of the Homeric poems are later than Hesiod and in some passages even imitate him. Here there is surely a good field for the application of linguistic tests. The method of Messrs. Sikes and Allen with the digamma should be enough by itself. But the field has never been worked, surely for the reason that it would produce nothing. If K be as late as Archilochus, the digamma-phenomena would show some similarity in the two cases. One knows, without collecting statistics, that there is nothing of the sort. One also knows that some "novelties" which appear in Hesiod and the Hymns and became fixed in later Greek, as *κἄλος*, *έμαυτόν*, etc., are not to be found in any "late" part of Homer. Or take the

metrical test. Hesiod and the Hymns show very distinct signs of degeneration. It has hardly been suggested that there are any imperfections in the verse of K.

These linguistic demonstrations have not been successful, and their failure has been admitted even by some of those who believe in the gradual building up and patching of the epics through centuries. In fact the procedure in this department of the *Pulverisierungsmethode* suffered from many defects. An initial bias precluded impartial dealing. Like unscrupulous advocates who confuse the issues, the operators threw on parts of the poems the burden of purging themselves of the presumption against them. Guilt did not require to be proved, only confirmed, by "peculiarities"; Philocleon was not to be balked. One cannot have much confidence in Menrad when he refuses to make in K an emendation which is necessary to save the face of O. This is to proceed *Κυκλωπικῶς*. There was also undue haste in characterizing phenomena as novelties, in spite of the warnings of Croiset and others, that we do not know the exact age of all the words in the Homeric language. And the possibility of the surface corruption which, as Mr. Agar says, "no literary masterpiece can quite escape, if it is to retain its hold on a people," was too often overlooked. It hardly seems to be thought of in Professor Bolling's paper already referred to. It is interesting to compare Hennings and Wilamowitz on such forms as *μαχούμενος* and *οὐσῆς* with Mr. Agar on the same. What authority on the digamma, for instance, would say in sober earnest that every neglect of it now apparent on the face of the text was in that text as originally composed? Many of the emendations made to remove such small blemishes have been confirmed by new MSS and papyri. Linguistic procedure was altogether too rigid. The possibility of an author's changing his style, deliberately or insensibly, with change of subject, as Shakspere and Goethe and Schiller have been shown to do, and as most poets do, was another consideration that was overlooked, as also the wondrous *polyonymia Homeri* and flexibility of the language of the poems. And the tests applied were devised with a haste and employed with an assurance which their inventors must regret. A more extended and less precipitate inquiry would have prevented the failures which ensued. There happened to be an unusually

large number of instances of ϵ s in Ω as compared with A. That was enough; it must be due to the original sin of Ω . But when the form was given fairer and wider treatment, the case based on it crumbled away. And lastly, there was the necessity for postulating the existence of strange beings, *ex machina*, shadowy and faint, in truth mere $\epsilon\delta\omega\lambda\alpha$, but strong to serve their creators when they had drunk of the blood and had been made $\pi\epsilon\pi\nu\nu\mu\epsilon\nu$ *ad hoc*, and had finally been converted into *Stümpers* or dolts who could not help bungling their intrusions. Nothing has caused more repugnance than this to the results which have been achieved. It was all in imitation of Wolf and his Pisistratus. The case was the one put by Sir Henry Maine in another connection—"a long blank period follows a genius, in which the imitativeness of his successors is the chief characteristic." The *Stümpers*, *Flick-Poets*, and *Bearbeiters* are the progeny of Pisistratus, and must vanish into the limbo to which the vast majority of Homeric scholars have now consigned the more imposing figure of the statesman himself.

The Homeric criticism of the nineteenth century left a wreck; the twentieth is "finding a way, after the wreck, to rise in." The higher criticism of Homer has been found out, and its excesses will hardly find a defender nowadays. Not the least of these was its arrogant intolerance of any opposition. That its view was the right one *omnium consensu*, and that Unitarians were not to reason with, were common forms of expression, so certain were the higher critics that they were the people and that Homeric wisdom would die with them. Even the usually judicious von Christ could speak of an opponent as *homo omni recti verique sensu destitutus*. Rothe who now receives the most generous recognition from opponents in Germany was let severely alone; in summaries of Homeric literature his thirty years' work would barely be mentioned. His procedure, like that of all Unitarians, was "unscientific"; the methods of true science were the privileged possession of the opposition. The term was applied even to Blass by Wilamowitz, and Cauer set Andrew Lang's *Homer and His Age* aside because it was "unscientific." To Professor Murray—in the first edition of his *RGE*—Lang's book was a mere "sniping at the outposts." And these men were the votaries of the systems of *Kompositionskritik* and

Quellenkritik which Drerup and Belzner, and Witte and Mülder, and others in Germany are now telling us are utterly useless for the solution of the problem; these were the patrons of the linguistic arts which have been described above. It was *hybris*, the way that wicked men have trod. And now, if satisfaction is expressed that a revulsion has taken place, and that common-sense is more in favor, Professor Prentice describes it as "malicious"¹ and begs Unitarians, as he persists in calling them in spite of Professor Murray, not to say, what no one has ever said, "that there have been no good results from the labor and study of scholars and critics all these years, or that we are all Unitarians now." *Irrita jurgia jactat*, as he feels that even in Germany, the home of this lost Homeric cause, the Unitarian dogs are beginning to have the best of it. What Unitarians do say is that the methods of the "science" of which the higher criticism claimed the monopoly were radically bad. That is abundantly shown by the history of their dealings with the language. In *JHS*, XXXI, 127, an appeal is made by "G.M." to a Unitarian not to "study to confute." Compliance is impossible so long as treatises devoted to the disintegration of the epics appeal to these linguistic criteria and treat the results obtained by means of them as conclusive. See, for one of the most recent statements of the assumption, Cuny, *Le nombre Duel en Grec*, 488.

The dictum of L. Friedländer, that no solution of the Homeric question can ever be other than merely hypothetical, may be correct, and it may be that scholars must continue to wander in the wilderness, *προπροκυλινδόμενοι*, without hope of a goal. But surely it should be allowable to the linguistic experts to hope that they may be able some day to say whether the language is or is not one, and, if it is, that consequently the poems are the product of a certain age. Their efforts to prove it is not have so far been, to use words of Professor Prentice, "an utter failure." *Nil dignum tanto hiatu*. That being so, and the attempts having been so numerous and determined, Unitarians may be pardoned if they begin to think that the enterprise is futile, and that they may venture to preserve a belief in the oneness of the Homeric language.

ST. ANDREWS
SCOTLAND

¹ *Am. J. Phil.*, 1913, 337 ff.